

## REMARKS

Claims 31-34 and 65-73 are pending. Claims 70-73 are allowed. The indication of the allowance of Claims 70-73 is noted with appreciation. Claims 31-34 and 65-69 have been rejected. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 31-34 and 65-73 is respectfully requested.

### Objections to the Specification

The abstract has been objected to. Applicants have amended the abstract to conform to the claimed subject matter. In view of the amendment of the abstract, withdrawal of this grounds for rejection is respectfully requested.

The disclosure has been objected to because the reference to the figures throughout the specification does not correspond with the figures set forth in the drawings. The specification has been amended to conform to the figures set forth in the drawings. In view of the amendments to the specification, withdrawal of this grounds for rejection is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been introduced by the amendments to the specification and abstract.

### The Provisional Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejection of Claims 31-34 and 65-69

Claims 31-34 and 65-69 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 13-25 of co-pending application No. 10/934,964. Withdrawal of the provisional double-patenting rejection is requested for the following reasons.

Applicants believe that the amendments to the abstract and specification noted above place the application in condition for allowance. As between two applications, when a provisional double-patenting rejection is the only rejection remaining in one application, the Examiner should withdraw the rejection and permit that application to issue as a patent, thereby converting the provisional double-patenting rejection in the second application to a

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100

double-patenting rejection at the time the first application issues as a patent. See M.P.E.P. Section 822.01. Applicants believe that by this amendment the provisional double-patenting rejection is the only remaining rejection. Pursuant to M.P.E.P. Section 822.01, applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow the present application to issue.

#### CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and foregoing remarks, applicants believe that Claims 31-34 and 65-73 are in condition for allowance. If any issues remain that may be expeditiously addressed in a telephone interview, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicants' attorney at 206.695.1755.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR  
JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>



George E. Renzoni, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 37,919  
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1755

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed envelope as first class mail with postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the below date.

Date: June 23, 2005

GER:jam/md

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100